



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,230	11/09/2000	Koji Nakamichi	FUJI 17.300	3312

7590 04/20/2004

KATTEN, MUCHIN, ZAVIS & ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
New York, NY 10022-2585

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

GECKIL, MEHMET B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Renail

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Pkg

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/709,230	NAKAMICHI ET AL
	Examiner Mehmet B. Geckil	Art Unit 2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3,5,6</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Art Unit: 2142

1. Claims 1-33 are presented for examination.
2. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are indefinite because of the following :

i) the phrase “..so as to..” used in base claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25 renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kodialam et al.

6. Kodialam et al (6,684,971) taught the invention (e.g., as in the exemplary claim 25) substantially as claimed including a communication network in which a plurality of label switched paths are provided and incoming packets are labeled and delivered through the network, the communications network comprising:

- a) an ingress unit (Figure 1, element N1, col 1, line 37 et seq) where the incoming packets are received and grouped (col 2, lines 65-67) into a plurality of forwarding elements, each forwarding element of the plurality of forwarding elements is allocated to a label switched path of the plurality of label switched paths (col 2, line 41 et seq, col 5, line 39 et seq, col 6, line 4 et seq, and col 7, line 1 et seq); and
- b) an egress unit (Figure 1, element N4, col 1, line 39 et seq) that receives the labeled packets from the plurality of label switched paths and removes the labels and reassembles the outgoing packets (cols 2-4).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time of the invention that the claimed invention differed from the teachings of Kodialam et al only by a degree, e.g., in the claimed traffic versus the taught packets. But this is

no more than a degree in a difference because the claimed traffic is an obvious variation of the packets and packets are actually used in MPLS. Other claimed features are all obvious variations of the well known features of MPLS routing as taught by Kodialam et al and also well known features of the IETF drafts submitted by the applicant as IDSs and the references listed by the European Examiner. For example, Kodialam et al taught using link weights (see col 10 line 6 et seq) that are claimed in claims 8,20, 30. Kodialam et al further taught assigning weights to links for traffic engineering and management (see col 9, line 26 et seq.) Using priorities (claims 10-12, 21-23) for traffic engineering is a well known feature of the traffic engineering in MPLS implementations using schedulers (see Figure 6, box 603 for the scheduler).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mehmet Geckil whose telephone number is (703) 305-9676. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 A.M. to 3:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Jack Harvey, can be reached on (703) 305-9705. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are listed hereinbelow.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700. Customer service number is (703) 306-5631.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Application/Control Number: 09/709,230
Art Unit: 2142

Page 5

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021
Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

3/19/04

MEHMET B. GECKIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mehmet Geckil